DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 165 332 95 EA 011 254

AUTHOR Erickson, Donald A.
TITLE An Agenda for Research on Private Education.
SPONS AGENCY National Inst. of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE 23 Feb 78
NOTE 27p.

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$2.06 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Academic Achievement; Alternative Schools; Catholic Schools; Data Bases; Dual Enrollment; Educational Alternatives; Educational Environment; *Educational Research; Elementary Secondary Education; Interagency Cooperation; Nonpublic School Aid; *Private Schools; *Research Needs; *Research Problems; *Research Proposals; School Community Relationship; School Organization

ABSTRACT

This paper distills from a research conference, arranged by the Council for American Private Education (CAPE), six questions that constitute an agenda for research on private education. Discussed after each of the following proposed questions are some of the past research studies relevant to the question, and the status of research in progress. (1) What organizational phenomena are most powerfully linked, either directly or indirectly, to widely valued pupil outcomes? (2) What can we learn, from studies involving private schools, about the range of feasible school influence on community well-being? (3) What data sources can be developed to make at least some of the special research opportunities in private schools available to scholars? (4) What are the major impediments to the development and perpetuation of private educational options in response to consumer demand, and what are the most promising strategies for limiting, reducing, or eliminating those impediments? (5) What are the circumstances, frequency, and range of existing relationships between public and private educational agencies? What mutual influences are exercised, with what consequences for communities as a whole? (6) How can we best advance our understanding of private schools as entities important in their own right, even apart from what we might learn about the fundamental processes that pervade all schools? (Author/MLF)

**********
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
**********

ED165332

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

# AN AGENDA FOR RESEARCH ON PRIVATE EDUCATION*

Donald A. Erickson
Center for Research on Private Education
University of San Francisco

On December 1 and 2, 1978, an extraordinary research conference (identified hereinafter as the "Washington Conference") was held in Washington, D. C. Arranged by the Council for American Private Education (CAPE), funded by the National Institute of Education (NIE), and involving notable scholars and practitioners, the conference addressed the question, "What is the most promising research now feasible in private schools?"[1]

This paper distills from the conference six questions which constitute, in a sense, an agenda for research on private education. Though I have attempted to reflect the conference consensus in the formulation of these questions, my judgments are unavoidably subjective. Another scholar reflecting on the same conference could easily produce another list, and perhaps even another emphasis.

Furthermore, during the several weeks since the Washington Conference, I have been influenced by talks with other scholars, by the completion (with Richard Nault) of a study of private schools[2], and by another agenda-building conference, sponsored by NIE (in San Diego, from January 27 to 29, 1978, on "School Organization and Effects"). I think these experiences sharpened the insights acquired at the Washington Conference but some colleagues might disagree.

---

*This paper was produced under contract to the National Institute of Education (NIE), and submitted on February 23, 1978. NIE should not, of course, be assumed to vouch for any judgments expressed here.

EA 011 254

Two further caveats are needed. First, I am proceeding on the assumption that NIE's interests, as reflected in the Washington Conference, veer toward the research pole of the research-development continuum. I therefore omit reference here to numerous excellent development projects, especially projects under the aegis of the Jesuit Secondary Education Association and the National Catholic Educational Association. This omission should not be taken to imply secondary importance, but rather an effort to hew to my task. Second, most examples in this paper are drawn from the conference discussion. I do not intend to suggest that studies not mentioned are necessarily less lustrous.

At the Washington Conference, the general approach was to list and discuss promising studies. A different strategy is adopted here -- to identify six major research questions which those studies addressed, subsequently discussing, illustratively, possible attacks upon the questions.

The exchanges at the Washington Conference were stimulating, variegated, and wide-ranging. I can discern no all-pervasive theme, save at a trivial level of abstraction. The motif that came closest to predominating was as follows: Private schools warrant inquiry, not only by virtue of their share of the student population, but also because they make some fundamental educational processes uniquely susceptible to inquiry. In a way, this statement flies in the face of the opinion often expressed of late that the distinction between public and private schools is analytically meaningless -- even misleading.

There is some truth in the latter opinion. If one defines as "public" a school that deals openly and informatively with its clients, or accepts clients from a wide range of income strata, or provides a door of opportunity to the oppressed and poor, then many privately sponsored schools are more "public" than many publicly sponsored schools.[3] In making this observation, however, one should not overlook powerful factors that rather uniformly distinguish public schools from private schools, at least in the current U.S. context. To illustrate: Nault and I have postulated very tentatively, on the basis of our recent work, that factors pervasively influencing school performance include (a) the extent of voluntarism and exactitude (costliness) in client affiliation, (b) the degree of institutional jeopardy (how reliable and liberal is the fiscal support, and to what extent is the supply of clients assured?), (c) the homogeneity of client expectations (can a reasonable consensus be found, and is the range of objectives manageable?); (d) the amount of value-congruence between home and school, (e) the scope of local autonomy, and (f) the availability in the school of powerful nonfiscal resources from the community (e.g., religious authority from a closely affiliated church, reinforcement from highly committed parents, or the influence of peers whose values are mutually catalytic).[4] To suggest one practical implication of all this: If further work should demonstrate that schools depending on voluntarily-provided client fees for the bulk (or all) of their fiscal sustenance (a) induce higher commitment from parents and students (partly because people place more value on what they pay for and attempt to ensure that their investments pay off),

(b) elicit enhanced performance from their personnel (partly because understaffing induces a strong sense of being needed and appreciated, and because "shared ordeal" produces social forces conducive to high achievement), (c) are more goal-focused and cost-efficient because the range of client expectations is manageable (partly because dissenters were screened out by the exacting affiliation process), then it might follow that all schools, public and private, would be better off if funded through user fees, made feasible for low-income families by creative taxation devices.[5] Research leading to findings and implications such as these not only reveals something about private schools — it illuminates fundamental processes that influence all schools.

These findings would never emerge from empirical work in public schools alone -- not as public schools are currently structured. The mode of fiscal support in public schools varies so little that the effects of more radical policies, such as a shift from tax support to user fees, are impossible to discern empirically. In many other respects, the narrow range of practice in public schools frustrates empirical inquiry.[7] Thus, private education should be viewed by scholars as providing variations for study and consequently, as I indicated earlier, as making some fundamental education processes uniquely susceptible to investigation.

Turning now to the most important research questions which I see as emerging from the Washington Conference:

1. What organizational phenomena (especially phenomena unusually susceptible to empirical scrutiny in private educational contexts) are most powerfully linked, either directly or indirectly, to widely valued pupil outcomes, intellective and non-intellective?

This question seems to warrant three modes of attack: (a) exploratory, hypothesis-generating, essentially phenomenological (including ethnographic) studies, designed to begin the development of grounded theory; (b) conceptual work to articulate in painstaking detail the postulated causal networks, probably complex, that connect the organizational phenomena, probably indirectly, to the widely-valued pupil outcomes[8]; (c) more traditional hypothesis-testing studies, intended to indicate what aspects of the theory are reasonably accurate and parsimonious (and thus useful reference points for practice), and what aspects warrant rejection, modification, or extension.

Many studies, representing combinations and variations of these three modes of attack, were identified and discussed at the Washington Conference:

(a) David Morton and his colleagues at the University of Rhode Island have been making provocative comparisons of public and Catholic schools, attempting to determine whether the superior achievement-test means of Catholic schools in that state may be traced to any special characteristics of these schools other than their tendency (perhaps generally overemphasized by scholars and laymen) to attract students with superior home backgrounds.[9] The Morton group has found, among other things, that in comparison with their public school counterparts: (i) the parochial school curriculum was concentrated more specifically on the basic skills; (ii) parochial school teachers rated their students as more cooperative, motivated, disciplined, cheerful, bright, and

interested; (iii) parochial school students missed fewer days of school per year, were more likely to discuss school with their parents, and were more often assisted by their parents when doing school work. All of these findings could be interpreted, I think, to indicate the presence of factors I suggested earlier, especially homogeneity of client expectations (permitting a definite curricular focus), value-congruence between home and school, and the availability of powerful nonfiscal resources from the community. No evidence emerged in the Morton study that the Catholic schools were selecting their students on any ground other than religion. Further work is needed, as William McCready has observed, to determine whether the apparent existence of highly supportive parental attitudes toward private schools is induced by the schools or is merely a function of subtle selection factors not detected in the Morton study.

(b) Barry D. Anderson, unexpectedly prevented from attending the Washington Conference, nevertheless communicated his interest in exploring some fairly dramatic policy differences between public and private schools. In collaboration with Jonathan Mark, Anderson recently found that costs in some public school systems in the St. Louis area had been <u>increasing</u> notably while the student enrollment was <u>decreasing</u>.[10] Not only had the new scarcity of instructional positions apparently curtailed teacher turnover drastically (teachers presumably were reluctant to leave their current positions for fear of not finding new ones), so higher and higher proportions of personnel were being paid at the higher salary levels, but also central administrative staffs

had been growing in size (perhaps as a way of providing jobs for displaced teachers). The researchers noted evidence to suggest that both trends (developing staffs composed mostly of teachers with many years of experience and increasing the size of downtown bureaucracies) were a good way to waste money. It would be a fruitful line of inquiry, I think, to determine whether private schools respond in markedly different ways to enrollment crises. It is interesting to note William McCready's report in this particular: "...In Chicago, the public schools which educate approximately one-quarter million students have approximately 3,500 full-time administrative employees. On the other hand, the Catholic schools in Chicago which educate approximately one-quarter million students students have a full-time (administrative) staff of approximately thirty-five."[11]

(c) Daniel L. Duke has a continuing interest in public and private "alternative schools." Perusing his research reports, I am struck by the impression that public alternative schools often adopt approaches which normally distinguish private schools from public schools, such as smaller size, more individual attention, more client homogeneity, more voluntarism in affiliation and other respects, inducements which attract unusually committed teachers, local autonomy, and a strong sense of community.[12] Much in line with the emphasis Nault and I have placed on institutional jeopardy as a source of commitment among personnel and clients, Duke observes that the alternative schools look best to him during their initial years, before they become firmly, comfortably established.[13]

(d) Nault and I propose to continue our above-mentioned work along three related lines in the five most westerly provinces of Canada. First, we are launching the next phase (with continuing support from the Spencer Foundation) of our cross-provincial comparisons, a phase in which we will explore further the consequences for Catholic schools of the dramatically

different policy frameworks that apply from province to province and sometimes from city to city (public versus private support and a number of degrees of coercion versus voluntarism in client affiliation). Second, we are projecting a longitudinal investigation of the effects of the public money (and related regulation) which will soon impinge on private schools throughout British Columbia for the first time in that province's history. Third, we are planning an inquiry into the "voucher experiment" now under way in at least two Canadian Cities; in these cities parents may choose freely (within limits of school capacity) from among all public and Catholic schools, and public funds are apportioned to all these schools on the basis of student enrollment.

(f) Several scholars at the Washington Conference expressed interest in uncovering the distinguishing characteristics of private schools which, according to putative evidence, are much more cost-effective than nearby public schools when dealing with disadvantaged minorities (e.g., Blacks and Hispanics). (Jencks suggested several years ago that Blacks might be better off if, like Catholics decades earlier, they developed private schools of their own as avenues of upward mobility, and more recently the Congress of Racial Equality has announced the conclusion the Blacks may have to find in private schools the educational opportunities they have sought thus far mainly in public schools.)[14] In terms of one proposal, (i) a national list of reputedly outstanding schools of this type would be obtained from well-informed persons in many areas of the country, (ii) by means of site visits and preliminary data, scholars would reduce the list to a relatively small sample (perhaps a dozen), stratified by region, of the schools whose reputations for superiority seemed most clearly warranted, (iii) data would be gathered, by means of close-up interdisciplinary methods, both to determine more conclusively whether the reputations of the "delightful dozen" were justified and to uncover consistent differences between these schools and nearby "run-of-the-mill" schools—differences which

could plausibly explain the contrasting levels of productivity, and (iv) if impressive results emerged, they would be reduced to specific hypotheses and subjected to rigorous statistic tests with a sample more adequate in size. Some work along this line has already been done by Eugene Hemrick and Thomas Vitullo-Martin.

(g) Bruce Cooper is planning to conduct, in three Jewish groups (Orthodox, Conservative, Reform), a comparison of parents who patronize Jewish day schools and parents who prefer other modes of Jewish education (e.g., afternonn and Saturday schools). Work of this kind should complement several approaches mentioned earlier. Parents may be sensitive to many subtle characteristics of schools that outside observers who do not consult them may overlook. Furthermore, as Bronfenbrenner has argued eloquently of late, it is ridiculous to act as if schools can be understood out of context, apart from their "ecology".[15] One must take into account a wide range of possible relationships between schools and homes, to say nothing of other institutions.

(h) I should mention parenthetically, for the benefit of scholars outside NIE, that NIE's current study of public and private high schools, directed by Susan Abramowitz, may help illuminate the organizational phenomena which, perhaps especially in private schools, are powerfully linked to widely valued pupil outcomes.

As for the second question emerging from the Washington Conference:

2. <u>What can we learn, from studies involving private schools, about the range of feasible school influence on community well being?</u>

In a number of respects, efforts to achieve greater racial justice

in society by means of racial integration in public schools have had disappointing results.[16] The legislators, administrators, and judicial personnel most directly involved in this effort have given little apparent consideration, however, to fundamental structural reforms in public schools (e.g., modes of fiscal support that provide unusual incentives) or to policies which visualize public and private schools as complementary agencies for community preservation and improvement. (John Coons and Stephen Sugarman have urged these approaches in Los Angeles). Furthermore, the racially segregating tendencies of some private schools have been documented and publicized in highly simplistic fashion with little attention to private schools which exhibit opposite dynamics, or to the important indirect or subtle influences of schools which appear, in superficial analyses, to have a negative community impact.[17] As long ago as 1966, Greeley and Rossi demonstrated that schools which segregate religiously may contribute, not to divisive attitudes, but to the ability of their students to relate to the wider world in adulthood.[18] Similar though not identical indications can be found in Kopan's work.[19] George Madaus and I, in our research for the President's Commission on School Finance, produced evidence that some private schools were playing a critical role in the stabilitization of communities threatened by a flight of middle-class residents to the suburbs.[20] However, our investigation in this regard was extremely limited by constraints of time and money, and thus the findings cannot be generalized unless corroborated with more adequate samples.

Thomas Vitullo-Martin reported at the Washington Conference two tentative but provocative suggestions from his own research in New York: First, students attending several private schools which enrolled few Blacks were drawn from areas where the public schools were even more segregated. Second, the City of New York might have prevented the emigration of many well-to-do families and thus, on balance, prevented the deterioration of many neighborhoods and many services to the poor, if it had partially subsidized the private schools these well-to-do families were patronizing. In the light of the continuing crises faced by many cities, it is difficult to understand why more resources have not been allocated to the development of reliable knowledge in this area. For example, the "delightful dozen" inquiry mentioned earlier might produce much relevant, useful evidence.

Racial integration is but one example of the many aspects of neighborhood well-being that may be affected, directly or indirectly, by private schools. McCready has suggested that private schools may contribute to the social diversity that apparently makes neighborhoods more attractive to many people.[21] Also, he points out, we know virtually nothing as yet concerning the effects, particularly in depressed inner-cities, of giving people more choice among schools and more control and influence within the schools their children attend.[22]

We are beginning to discover how public school reputations affect neighborhood attractiveness and property values. It seems obvious that we should also know about the impact of the availability and reputations of private schools.

3. In the light of the special research opportunities in private schools, what data sources can be developed to make at least some of these opportunities widely, efficiently available to scholars?

Important advances have been made of late in the availability of systematic information about the nation's private schools. The National Association of Independent Schools and the Board of Parish Education of the Lutheran Church -- Missouri Synod -- have for many years engaged in highly commendable efforts to assemble data in readily available form, about the schools affiliated with them.[23] Since 1969, the data bank of the National Catholic Education Association (NCEA) has been a highly useful source of information for scholars.[24] The National Center for Educational Statstics (NCES) now provides significantly more useful data on private schools than heretofore.[25] Nault, Cooper, and I completed an enrollment-trend analysis in 1977 which is still useful for many purposes and will soon be published by NIE in a book on changing enrollment and its implications in public and private schools.[26] On the basis of a "universe list" of private schools compiled by the Council for American Private Education (CAPE), NCES is now conducting, through CAPE and NCEA, a systematic national study of major private school characteristics, the results of which should be useful to many scholars. CAPE has recently been involved in efforts to improve the questions asked, relevant to private schools, by the U.S. Bureau of the Census. In addition, CAPE has been instrumental in the

recent creation of the National Repository of nformation on American Private Schools by ERIC (the Educational Resources Information Center) system.[27] The recently established organization, Associates for Research on Private Education (ARPE), has created a service that will scan a wide variety of sources for articles, chapters, books, theses, etc., relevant to private schools and will provide abstracts of the materials thus identified.[28] Recently, Robert Lamborn of CAPE and I met with three officials at ERIC's national headquarters to discuss ways of improving ERIC's processing of material relevant to private schools, and especially some possible relationships between the ERIC system and the above-mentioned ARPE scanning and abstracting service. Further efforts are under way in the latter particular.

One particularly important aspect of data availability concerns non-aggregative data banks -- systematic masses of data, most likely on computer tapes or discs, which scholars can analyze in studies in which the student, the teacher, and other micro-entities are the units of analysis. Public school systems and the National Assessment of Educational Progress have been widely criticized for gathering data in an aggregated form that makes sophisticated (and sometimes even unsophisticated) policy analyses impossible. The political realities which dictate that largely innocuous approach to data acquisition show signs of intensifying rather than diminishing. Remarkably little attention has been given to the most obvious alternative -- acquire the data from private schools, which function within an entirely different framework of political constraints.

Over a period of nearly two decades I have found, both in my own inquiries and in student dissertations, that private schools in general are vastly more receptive than public schools to empirical inquiry: informal queries to colleagues suggest that this experience is widespread. At least two small beginnings toward the assembling of significant banks of non-aggregated data are discernible at this point. Barry Anderson has been massing on computer tapes, at Washington University, impressive arrays of data which he plans to utilize in various ways in his future inquiries, including his above-mentioned explorations of stark policy contrasts between public and private schools. I am currently in touch with two large Catholic dioceses whose leaders are planning the development of what, so far as we can ascertain, may be the first computerized data processing system in which all raw data (on students, teachers, schools, etc.) will enter the system in non-aggregated form, making possible a wide variety of sophisticated longitudinal analyses. As my major reason for assisting in this effort, I am interested in incorporating into the system an unprecedented annual array of data designed to contribute to the work of scholars in several frontier areas, especially those areas now roughly subsumed by the rubric, "school organization and effects," the topic of the above-mentioned San Diego Conference sponsored by NIE.

Assuming, as it seems entirely valid to do, that a primary impediment to progress in a number of areas of educational research appears to be the discouragingly widespread need to use proxies in the absence of directly relevant variables, and to use aggregate data

when micro-units of analysis are essential to analytic clarity, high priority should be given to assembling the above-suggested non-aggregative banks of data from private school organizations that would actively cooperate. To do so would require sophisticated, painstaking effort over several months, at least. Establishing priorities among the long lists of data which even a few carefully-selected scholars might request would be an exceedingly critical and demanding task, though far from impossible. Something like $100,000 perspicaciously devoted to this work might do more to advance knowledge than $100 million spent on torturous, enormously complex statistical analyses applied to ridiculous cross-sectional proxies and aggregations. Numerous leading scholars would need to participate extensively in the effort, lest the information turn out to be appropriate only to ill-conceived or outmoded conceptualizations.

4. What are the major impediments to the development and perpetuation of private educational options in response to consumer demand, and what are the most promising strategies for limiting, reducing, or eliminating those impediments?

Economists have delineated well various aspects of the "double taxation" handicap imposed on patrons of private schools, and thus on private schools themselves.[29] Some aspects of the total financial picture are constantly changing, however. Barry Anderson has suggested an analysis of the apparent tendency for the nation's public sector to mushroom out of control, partly by "feeding on the private sector."

As he observes, recent developments relating to the particularly liberal federal civil service retirement system (which benefits the public sector exclusively), in juxtaposition to Congressional enactment of a new schedule of precipitous Social Security tax increases (which might add enormously to personnel costs in the private sector, including hard-pressed educational institutions) may be a good example of the tendency. Few developments of this type have been adequately analyzed and brought to the public attention as a basis for rational policy. In the meantime, greater and greater proportions of the private sector, especially our highly vulnerable private educational institutions, may be obliterated, not as a result of fact-enlightened debate in the public forum, but through default.

Students of the law, similarly, have published voluminous analyses of the Supreme Court's role in denying many forms of fiscal redress to private schools, and of the relationship of that role, as rationalized by the Court, to the history of the First Amendment, to the strong strain of anti-Catholic prejudice in American culture, and to numerous other factors.[30] Here again, though extensive work has been done, more remains to be done. Stephen Arons is plowing new ground, currently with support from the Rockefeller Brothers Fund, on implications, in the light of the First Amendment, of the increasingly transparent fact that public schools, like church-related schools, are far from neutral in life style and ideology.[31] Along

with others at Berkeley, Professors Coons and Sugarman of the University of California School of Law have been analyzing the issue of where, in the light of the child's best interests, authority to govern the child's upbringing (including formal education) is best placed, and have designed numerous creative strategies for introducing more consumer choice into the legal frameworks (and resulting fiscal constraints) that govern public and private schools in the United States.[32]

Some of the most provocative recent thinking along this line has been done by economist E. G. West, who has produced a highly originative analysis of fundamental legal and economic issues.[33] West has argued persuasively, for example, that the classic economic arguments for "free", tax-supported schools have all collapsed. He advocates gradual movement (by means which he carefully delineates) toward a policy of supporting all schools, public and private, through user fees. He effectively destroys the myth that impoverished people do not currently pay for the education of their offspring (through a lifetime of taxation), and proposes a novel system of future taxation that might function as a loan arrangement, enabling people to pay schooling costs while their children are in school, paying out of lifetime earnings rather than current income. He demonstrates that the basic fiscal consequences for schools of his positive pricing system need not be radically different from the fiscal consequences of present arrangements, except that current constraints on consumer choice,plus the negative results of guaranteeing the survival of public school systems, regardless of their effectiveness, would be

overcome in a manner that the Supreme Court would be hard put to brand as unconstitutional.

It should be obvious, even to the relatively uninitiated, that funds should be available for the highly promising inquiries going forward in this area.

5. What is the range of existing relationships (cooperative, competitive, complementary) between public and private educational agencies? Under what circumstances, and with what frequency, are the relationships complementary, cooperative, competitive, antagonistic? What mutual influences are exercised, with what consequences for communities and society as a whole?

Those of us who have observed public and private educational agencies over the years know that relationships between them run a wide gamut between extensive, cordial cooperation to intense, destructive, cynical antagonism. In the above-mentioned work for the President's Commission on School Finance, Madaus and I produced 24 case studies of cooperation between public and private (almost entirely Catholic) schools at the local level.[34] These case studies were widely distributed geographically, but available resources did not permit us to determine how widespread was any type of cooperation. In the latest of a series of studies of private school participation under Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, it is evident that the intent of the Congress is still subverted extensively by state and local public educational agencies.[35] The results of

of "shared time" programs in many cities, though sometimes examined locally, have never in recent years, to my knowledge, been analyzed systematically as a national phenomenon.[36] Consequently, despite an extensive history of public-private relationships in education, much of it accessible in existing documents, we know very little indeed about the causes, dynamics, and consequences of these relationships, though we may be sure that the nation's public and private schools often have power to facilitate or impede each other's efforts. The consequences of the interaction of these schools for the wider community must often be profound.

One aspect of this question is particularly neglected, in my personal view: Beyond two efforts of my own to document -- largely through the methods of "oral history" -- what actually happens to people when public educational officials prosecute parents under laws which compel child attendance, during a given age bracket, at some locus of instruction which a state is willing to recognize as a "school", this story, which during the past three decades alone must involve a hundred episodes of human misery, is still essentially untold, and will soon become largely inaccessible except in the meager detail of fortuitous written records, unless something more systematic is done, and soon.[37] In the absence of a large-scale study launched by an interested historian, this task is perhaps best undertaken in decentralized fashion, by a few dozen graduate students, each carefully documenting, mostly by means of careful, extensive interviewing and cross-checking, the events in a single episode. Thus far,

I have had no success in persuading students to undertake this task, partly because of the travel costs which they would normally have to assume. Very recently, however, I have received an encouraging response to the suggestion that some agency should create a small grant fund for this purpose. Parenthetically, then, let me encourage professors and students who are interested in this type of research to contact me, in case the needed funds become available soon.[38]

6. How can we best advance our understanding of private schools as entities important in their own right, even apart from what we might learn about the fundamental processes that pervade all schools?

I have often been contacted, as I assume many other scholars have been, for rather straightforward information about private schools, such as their levels of fiscal support, the characteristics of their patrons or the most basic reasons why they seem more cost-effective than public schools in many situations. It is dismaying to respond to most of these inquiries with a declaration of ignorance, as if this nation did not care about the schools which educated approximately ten percent of all its young at the elementary and secondary levels. The situation has improved somewhat in connection with several efforts discussed earlier in this paper, and could improve further in connection with several efforts suggested earlier. To mention another three specific ideas: Adequate support should be made available, I think, for the efforts of Patrick Duffy to provide the first reasonably comprehensive delineation

of legal principles affecting private schools, and for Ralph Lane's interest in the varying social networks that different private schools create (some private schools seem, for example, to cater to cosmopolitans, others to locals). We need, as Lane points out, to describe the ways in which Catholic school history differs in some cities, apparently dramatically, from the pattern so elegantly delineated in Chicago by James Sanders.[39] I am fascinated by two ideas advanced by Richard Nault: We should study in rich detail the connection between philosophy and various aspects of day-to-day functioning in several distinctive private school types that are now endangered species, and we should examine, in these and other private schools, the determinants and consequences of systems of belief and value in human beings. But since the latter two ideas, particularly, have implications for every aspect of our society, we are obviously back full circle to the first research question mentioned in this paper. We thus have illustrated again a central dictum of scholarly inquiry: The disinterested pursuit of knowledge often turns out, in retrospect, to be the most productive way of ameliorating human problems.

NOTES

1. A list of the conference participants appears in the Appendix.

2. Donald A. ERickson and Richard L. Nault, "Currency, Choice, and Commitment: An Exploratory Study of the Effects of Public Money and Related Regulation on Canadian Catholic Schools: Research Report Submitted to the Spencer Foundation" (San Francisco, Ca.: Center for Research on Private Education, University of San

Francisco, January, 1978; copies of a 43-page abstract are available postpaid for $3.00, plus an additional 50¢ for rush orders, payable to the University of San Francisco).

3. Christopher Jencks, "Giving Parents Money to Pay for Schooling: Education Vouchers", New Republic, July 4, 1970, p. 21; Judith Areen and Christopher Jencks, "Education Vouchers: A Proposal for Diversity and Choice," Teachers College Record 72 (Feb., 1971): 330.

4. Erickson and Nault, "Currency, Choice, and Commitment."

5. It appears to us, at least in terms of our tentative, exploratory evidence, that there are some close parallels between the effects of "understaffing" on teachers and the effects of "undermanning" (in extracurricular activities) on students. Cf. R. G. Barker and P. V. Gump, Big School, Small School (Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 1968).

6. E. G. West, Nonpublic School Aid (Lexington, Mass.: Lexington Books, 1976).

7. Eric A. Hanushek and John F. Kain, "On the Value of Equality of Educational Opportunity as a Guide to Public Policy," in Frederick Mosteller and Daniel P. Moynihan (eds.), On Equality of Educational Opportunity (New York: Random House, 1972), p. 116-145.

8. I have provided an example of such a causal linkage elsewhere, noting that "undermanning" (a manipulable organizational variable) in student extra-curricular activities has been linked empirically to student commitment to school in general and to those activities in particular, and that participation in those activities, in turn, has been linked to such widely valued student outcomes as later success in college. See Donald A. Erickson (ed.), Educational Organization and Administration ("Readings in Educational Research," sponsored by the American Educational Research Association; Berkeley, Ca.: McCutchan Publishing Corporation, 1977), 255-61.

9. David S. Morton et al., "A Comprehensive Analysis of Differences in Public and Parochial School Student Performance on Standardized Tests of Achievement" (paper presented at Annual Meeting of American Educational Research Association, New York City, April, 1977).

10. Barry D. Anderson and Jonathan Mark, "Teacher Mobility and Productivity in a Metropolitan Area: A Seven Year Case Study," Urban Education 12 (April, 1977): 15-36.

11. William C. McCready, "Research on Private Education: Suggestions, Priorities, and Obstacles" (paper prepared for discussion at the Washington Conference, December 1, 1977), p. 12.

12. Daniel L. Duke and Cheryl Perry, "Can Alternative Schools Succeed Where Benjamin Spock, Spiro Agnew, and B. F. Skinner Have Failed?" (Stanford University, offset manuscript, 1977); Daniel L. Duke and Irene Muzio, "How Effective Are Alternative Schools: A Review of Recent Evaluations and Reports" (Stnaford University, offset manuscript, 1976); Daniel L. Duke, The ReTransformation of the School (Chicago: Nelson Hall, in press).

13. Duke, comment made at Washington Conference.

14. In testimony before the Committee on Finance, Subcommittee on Taxation and Debt Management, U.S. Senate, on January 18, 1978, Mr. Voctor Solomon, Field Director, Congress of Racial Equality, testified that his organization had given up on trying to achieve adequate educational opportunities for Black students in public schools and was now turning to private schools. Years earlier, this tactic had been advocated in Christopher Jencks, "Private Schools for Black Children," New York Times Magazine, Nov. 3, 1968, pp. 130-141. For evidence that Catholic schools once facilitated the movement of oppressed Catholics into the middle class, see Andrew M. Greeley and Peter H. Rossi, The Education of Americans (Chicago: Aldine Publishing Company, 1966).

15. Urie Bronfenbrenner, "The experimental Ecology of Education" Educational Researcher 5 (October, 1976): 5-15; and "School Effectiveness in Ecological Perspective" (paper prepared for the National Institute of Education's National Invitational Conference on School Organization and Effects, San Diego Hilton Hotel, San Diego, January 27-29, 1978).

16. E.g., James S. Coleman, "Recent Trends in School Integration," Educational Researcher 4 (July-August, 1975): 3-12.

17. David Nevin and Robert E. Bills, The Schools That Fear Built: Segregationist Academies in the South (Washington, D.C.: Acropolis Books, Ltd., 1976).

18. Greeley and Rossi, The Education of Catholic Americans.

19. Andrew Thomas Kopan, "Education and Greek Immigrants in Chicago: 1892-1973: A Study in Ethnic Survival" (Ph. D. dissertation, Department of Education, University of Chicago, 1974).

20. Donald A. Erickson and George F. Madaus, Issues of Aid to Nonpublic Schools: Vol. I: Economic and Social Issues of Educational Pluralism, Report to the President's Commission on School Finance (Chestnut Hill, Mass.: Center for Field Research and School Studies, Boston College, 1971), pp. V:51 - V:96.

21. McCready, "Research on Private Education," pp. 14-15.

22. Ibid., pp. 15-16.

23. The National Association of Independent Schools is located at 4 Liberty Square, Boston, Mass. 02109. The Board of Parish Education, The Lutheran Church -- Missouri Synod, is at 3558 South Jefferson Avenue, St. Louis, Missouri 63118.

24. Information about the data bank may be obtained from National Catholic Educational Association, Suite 350, One Dupont Circle, Washington, D. C. 20036.

25. There are more than a dozen useful, well designed tables and graphs, for example, in Mary A. Golladay, The Condition of Education: 1977 Edition: A Statistical Report on the Condition of Education in the United States, Volume 3, Part 1 (Washington, D. C.: National Center for Education Statistics, 1977).

26. Donald A. Erickson, Richard L. Nault, and Bruce S. Cooper, assisted by Robert L. Lamborn, "Recent Enrollment Trends in U.S. Nonpublic Schools: Final Report to the National Institute of Education" (Simon Fraser University, Burnaby, B.C., February, 1977, Document No. ED 140 504, available from ERIC Document Reproduction Service, P. O. Box 190, Arlington, Virginia 22210).

27. Copies of the brochure describing the National Repository of Information on American Private Schools may be obtained from ERIC, National Institute of Education, Washington, D. C. 20208.

28. For further information on ARPE, contact me at the Center for Research on Private Education, University of San Francisco, San Francisco, California 94117. (ARPE also publishes an annual directory of the activities and addresses of relevant scholars.)

29. E. g., Milton Friedman, Capitalism and Freedom (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1962).

30. Many of these analyses are summarized in Donald A. Erickson, "Legal Impediments to Private Educational Alternatives," in Clifford P. Hooker (ed.), Law and Education, Seventy-seventh Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1978), pp. 116-139.

31. Stephen Arons, "The Separation of School and State: Pierce Reconsidered," Harvard Educational Review 46 (February, 1976): 76 - 104.

32. E.g., John E. Coons and Stephen D. Sugarman, "A Case for Choice," in James E. Coleman et al., Parents, Teachers, and Children: Prospects for Choice in American Education (San Francisco, Ca.: Institute for Contemporary Studies, 1977), pp. 129-148.

33. West, Nonpublic School Aid; and "The Perils of Public Education," The Freeman 27 (Nov., 1977): 681-699.

34. Erickson and Madaus, Issues of Aid to Nonpublic Schools, Vol. III: Public Assistance Programs for Nonpublic Schools, pp. (CS:1):1 - (CS:24): 13.

35. For information concerning the most recent work on this topic, contact Thomas Vitullo-Martin, 225 W. 86th Street, #503, New York, N.Y. 10024.

36. E.g., James F. Redmond, An Evaluation of the Experiment in Shared-Time, A Report to the Chicago Board of Education (Chicago, Il: Chicago Board of Education, 1969). The latest national surveys of this phenomenon appear to be the following: Research Division - National Education Association, Shared-Time Programs: An Exploratory Study, Research Report 1964-R 10 (Washington, D.C.: the Association, 1964); James E. Gibbs, Jr., et al., Dual Enrollment in Public and Nonpublic Schools: Case Studies of Nine Communities (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Office of Education, 1965).

37. Donald A. Erickson, "The 'Plain People' and American Democracy," Commentary 45 (January, 1968): 36-44; and "The Persecution of LeRoy Garber," School Review 78 (November, 1969): 81-90.

38. See address under note 28, above.

39. James W. Sanders, The Education of an Urban Minority: Catholics in Chicago, 1833-1965 (New York: Oxford University Press, 1976).

## APPENDIX

### Participants in the "Washington Conference"

Susan Abramowitz
National Institute of Education

Leonard L. Baird
Educational Testing Service

Peter Briggs
Greenwich Country Day School

Bruce Cooper
Dartmouth College

Denis Doyle
National Institute of Education

Daniel L. Duke
Stanford University

Donald A. Erickson
University of San Francisco

Rhoda Goldstein
National Catholic Education Association

Eugene Hemrich
U. S. Catholic Conference

Otto Kraushaar
President Emeritus, Goucher College

Robert L. Lamborn
Council for American Private Education

William C. McCready
National Opinion Research Center

George Madaus
Boston College

David Morton
University of Rhode Island

Russell Mullen
National Institute of Education

Richard Nault
Washington University

John D. Olsen
National Catholic Education Association

Fred Rhinelander
Council for American Private Education

Robert J. Starratt
Fordham University

Merton Strommen
Search Institute

Stephen G. Sugarman
University of California, Berkeley